

## INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant sincerely thanks Examiner Bullock and his Supervisor for discussing the present application with Applicant's attorney, Robert G. Hartman, during an interview of September 26, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney submitted that the Office has not shown in the outstanding Office Action how the cited §102 reference ("SMIL") discloses all of the elements of Applicant's independent claims 1 and 19. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution, and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, Applicant's attorney proposed an amendment to independent claim 1. Although no agreement was reached, both of the Examiners were receptive to the amendment and indicated that Examiner Bullock would reexamine the SMIL reference and, if necessary, would update his search. Applicant has accordingly amended claim 1 as discussed during the interview.

In regards to independent claim 19, meanwhile, both of the Examiners agreed that the SMIL reference fails to disclose this claim. Applicant thanks the Examiners for this indication. Again, the Examiners also indicated that Examiner Bullock would update his search.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney also traversed the rejection of claims 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant's attorney understood the Examiners to state that if the term "multimedia device" were shown to correspond to hardware, then the rejection would be withdrawn. Applicant thanks the Examiners for this indication.

Applicant again sincerely thanks both Examiners for their time. Applicant also encourages Examiner Bullock to call Applicant's attorney before issuance of an Action, if the next anticipated Action is anything other than a Notice of Allowance.